

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, September 12, 2002

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Chairman Linda Hoffman, Kent Forsgren, Bart Hill, Cindy Roybal, Cory Ritz, Sid Young, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman. Commissioner Larry Jensen was absent. City Engineer Paul Hirst was present for discussion of agenda item #2.

Chairman Hoffman called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. **Cory Ritz** offered the invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Cindy Roybal *MOVED* that the minutes of the August 22, 2002, Planning Commission Meeting be approved with corrections as noted. **Sid Young** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor. Kent Forsgren abstained due to his absence during the August 22nd meeting.

LONNIE BULLARD REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR FINAL PLAT APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE FIRST PLAT (CONSISTING OF 7 LOTS) OF THE OAKWOOD ESTATES PHASE II SUBDIVISION LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1800 NORTH COMPTON ROAD IN A LR-F ZONE (S-7-01) (Agenda Item #2)

David Petersen reviewed the suggested motion in the packet, including the following points:

- ❏ The developer had received a flood control permit from the County and had verified receipt with Mr. Petersen.
- ❏ The improvement drawings still had some unresolved issues.
- ❏ Mr. Petersen suggested a temporary open space easement over Parcel A which could be revised and a permanent open space easement placed in a new location at the time the entire property was developed.
- ❏ The developer had been asked to provide engineering information to prevent flooding during a 50 to 100 year storm and had done so.

- ▮ Neighboring property owners (Mr. Peterson, address: 1715 North Canyon Circle, in particular) had approached the City Planner regarding past promises to construct a berm for flooding protection in the future.

Linda Hoffman inquired about what unresolved issues remained on the improvement drawings.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the details that had not as yet been accomplished on the improvement drawings and stated he knew of no issues that should hold up consideration of approval. Unresolved issues included concerns by Public Works, the City Engineer, and Planning Commission which the developer indicated could be rectified.

Mr. Young asked about the berm mentioned by neighbors. With recent, severe flooding problems in the City, he was concerned that proper engineering and citizen considerations be addressed.

Lonnie Bullard (developer) explained that a swale exists on the property in the area where the neighbors had requested a berm. The area was full of debris, which he committed to clean out. Mr. Bullard felt that the water would drain through the swale if the debris was kept out and the area maintained. He said he and his partners would continue to maintain the property in the future. Mr. Bullard expressed concern regarding a concrete access he had been required to provide.

Paul Hirst said he was unconcerned about whether the access to the manholes was concrete or asphalt. Access needed to be adequate for the 5 ton “vac-truck” that Public Works would need to bring in to maintain the drainage lines. However, Mr. Hirst did feel that due to the residential nature of the area, it may be well to consider the quality of the concrete roadway rather than the asphalt.

David Wilding (Developer’s Engineer) stated they were hoping for approval of the application pending resolution of the remaining issues. The developers had already done extensive work with the County regarding flood control. There were a few notes that needed to be placed on the plat.

Sid Young *MOVED* that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council grant final plat approval for the first plat of the Oakwood Estates Phase II Subdivision located at approximately 1800 North Compton Road subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of preliminary plat approval, including but not limited to the following:
 - A. The applicant must obtain a flood control permit from Davis County and provide a copy of the permit to the City.

- B. Final improvement drawings, including a grading and drainage plan (and a re-vegetation plan) and plans for either a concrete or an asphalt access to manholes for Public Works shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, Planning Department, Central Davis County Sewer District, and FAPID. The developer must be sensitive to NPDES requirements mandated by the EPA, meet minimum slope requirements of 12% for the streets and follow minimum cut and fill standards required by ordinance.
 - C. Prepare a maintenance plan for the associated conservation land for review and approval by the City.
 - D. The applicant shall implement flooding and erosion control measures, including an earthen berm acceptable to the City especially for the temporary turn-around area. Engineering plans for a 50- to 100-year storm should be submitted as part of the final plat application.
- 2. The developer shall enter into a Development Agreement with the City whereby a temporary conservation easement shall be placed over Parcel "A." This temporary conservation easement shall be removed from the property when Parcels "A" and "B" develop in accordance with the approved preliminary plat. At such time, the Developer shall grant to the City a permanent conservation easement over and across open space areas identified during the preliminary plat approval process.
 - 3. The conservation area illustrated on Lot 207 shall be clearly identified as a "Conservation Easement" on the plat.
 - 4. All lots shall have front and rear yard public utility easements of 10 feet and at least one side yard easement which shall be the same dimension as the minimum side yard required by the Zoning Ordinance.
 - 5. A note shall be placed on the final plat indicating that a soil report has been prepared and submitted to the City for the proposed subdivision in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance.
 - 6. An extension agreement shall be placed on Lots 206 and 207 for the purpose of sidewalk installation along those lots.

Cindy Roybal seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Reasons for the motion included:

- ¬ The application was in accordance with City ordinances and standards.
- ¬ Engineering designs for flooding exceeded current City standards.

- ▮ The developers either have met or will meet all requests made by the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC HEARING: DANVILLE LAND INVESTMENTS, L.L.C. REQUEST FOR A REVIEW OF A CONCEPT PLAN RESUBMITTAL REGARDING AN APPLICATION TO AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN FROM RURAL RESIDENTIAL DENSITY TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ON APPROXIMATELY 54 ACRES OF LAND GENERALLY LOCATED WEST OF I-15, SOUTH OF SHEPARD LANE, AND EAST OF THE DRG&W RAILROAD TRACKS, AND TO FURTHER REZONE SAID PROPERTY FROM A (AGRICULTURE) TO R-4 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) (Z-3-02) (Agenda Item #3)

Background Information:

On May 9, 2002, the Planning Commission voted to deny application #Z-3-02 for a general plan amendment and zone change (as noted in letter dated May 24, 2002). The Commission recommendation has not been considered by the City Council. Instead, the applicant revised the concept plan presented to the Planning Commission and presented these ideas to a small neighborhood committee representing interests in the area. This committee was formed by the applicant. Enclosed for the review of the Planning Commission was a new version of the concept plan related to the request referenced above. The information contained in the May 9, 2002, staff report appears to still be relevant to the new concept plan.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen gave a brief review of the background information. He stated that the developer had met with a citizens' committee to negotiate development plans that would hopefully be acceptable to the nearby residents.

Chairman Hoffman opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING* and invited the applicant to address the Commission to begin.

Nate Pugsley (developer) said the working committee had been very helpful in making suggestions for the development. Traffic had been planned to head south out of the new subdivision, diverting it away from the Shepard Lane area. The current plan reduced the initial count for dwelling units by 130. The plans would still provide for a broad range of incomes. The plan also included a tot lot, trails, and open space. The developer had incorporated many of the ideas given by the citizens.

Bruce Richards (1184 North Set Court) stated he was a nearby neighbor and a member of the committee. He felt he was voicing the concerns of himself and his neighbors, including:

- ▮ The neighbors had expressed appreciation for the opportunity to meet with the developer and express their concerns and ideas.

- ▮ Mr. Richards disagreed with the developer's assessment that 95 percent of the residents were in favor of the subdivision. There had been a lot of progress made in the design of the development, but there was still a great deal to be done.
- ▮ Mr. Richards felt that the General Plan should remain as it is and that the area remain zoned as A or AE with either one acre or half acre lots.
- ▮ The density planned for the proposed development would negatively impact that community. Traffic would be a great concern.
- ▮ If the planned road going south to connect to North Pointe is not constructed, traffic would be intolerable.
- ▮ Surrounding communities should be contacted and designs should be coordinated. The subdivision should be compatible with surrounding developments.

Paul Hayward (1663 West 1410 North) said he had discussed the issues with his wife and they were both opposed to the development. He felt that if indeed there was enough financing to build the road, then there was something out of balance. Also, the City was trying to create walkable communities, but in this proposed development there was nowhere to walk. This area was cut off from the rest of the City because of high traffic roads. Some development, such as close-by commercial and park developments, were at least 20 years in the future. Because there were too many unresolved issues, the proposed subdivision should not be approved and the General Plan should not be revised at this time.

Alan Worsted (1651 West 1410 North) stated he agreed with the previous two speakers and opposed the subdivision. Traffic on Shepard Lane is very congested and the subdivision would make things much worse. Traffic patterns currently cannot accommodate the increase of the proposed housing.

Rick Turnbow (Kaysville resident) stated he lived just to the north of the proposed subdivision. Although he did not live in Farmington, he said that he shopped in Farmington and that his tax dollars were spent in the City. He was opposed to the development.

Merrill Moore (1105 North 1100 North) said that the neighborhood had opposed the Kmart store and it had gone in anyway. Then it failed. Now the subdivision is being proposed and the neighborhood is opposed. The City needs to listen to the wishes of the citizens.

James Christensen (Kaysville resident) felt there was not a need for the subdivision and therefore it should be opposed.

John Sheets (1368 Fairway) had done a traffic count on Shepard Lane. He said there had been 6.8 cars between 3 and 5 minutes. After 5 P.M. there was a steady stream of cars. The traffic was unsafe and would get worse if the subdivision was allowed.

Bob Steed (654 West Ridgewood) felt that commercial development and residential development in Farmington was unbalanced. Until residential development comes naturally, commercial and service-oriented development will not come. He felt the large subdivision was premature. The building activity in the west part of Farmington was already more than the City could handle. He recognized that because major roads converge in the City there would have to be more development, but it needed to be managed.

Randy Bass (Kerrybrook Drive, Kaysville) said he moved to his third home in the area and chose the current residence because it was in an area that required ½ acre lots. He loved the open space beauty of the area and felt that the subdivision would spoil what he had moved there for.

Alan Blood (Kerrybrook Drive, Kaysville) felt there was great value in the 1 and ½ acre lots. He had bought his home after researching the master plan for the area. He felt the General Plan should remain the way it was.

With no further comments **Chairman Hoffman** *CLOSED* the public hearing. She noted there were a great many Kaysville residents in attendance and that their comments were welcome.

The Planning Commission discussed the agenda item including the following points:

- The City Council had initiated an economic development study for the City. The Council was committed to protecting the life style of Farmington but were faced with a need for increased revenue to provide services and infrastructure. The tax increase just passed was only the second one in 20 years. The Council was very reticent to place the financial burden on the residents and were looking for

commercial tax base solutions in a balanced and well-reasoned manner. The study will be complete by the end of the fiscal year. However, some information will be available in 2 or 3 months. The study should help determine the best location for both residential and commercial development, along with traffic designs.

- The quality of the proposed subdivision was not in question. The developer had a good reputation.
- There were several large tracts of property available in the City which could develop.
- Public input is critical. The forthcoming economic study will take into account the

wishes of the public.

- ▮ The current design for the proposed subdivision (both sections) calls for 2.3 dwellings per acre. The developer stated he had understood that the City and the residents could accept that density.
- ▮ The developer had worked to get a consensus from the public meetings and had tried to include public ideas into the design.
- ▮ The Commission felt that citizen concerns, especially regarding traffic problems, were valid. Traffic needs would have to be considered on the basis that the new road may not be constructed.
- ▮ By consensus the Commission felt that it may be best to wait for preliminary information from the economic study before making a decision on such a large subdivision.
- ▮ Because of rezoning and General Plan amendment rules, a decision by the Commission would need to wait until the next planned meeting.

Cory Ritz *MOVED* to continue the public hearing for agenda item #3 to September 16, 2002 to allow time for proper notification. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. It was noted that further input would be welcomed, including written comments.

PUBLIC HEARING: JULIE STRINGFELLOW REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO MODIFY CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT C-13-95 BY INCREASING THE NUMBER OF THOSE ATTENDING THE LI'L RASCALS PRESCHOOL FROM 12 TO 14

CHILDREN. THE PRESCHOOL IS LOCATED AT 1614 WEST 1410 NORTH IN AN R-2 ZONE (Agenda Item #4)

Chairman Hoffman opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING* and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Julie Stringfellow (applicant) stated she was asking for an increase of 1 child for the preschool. She was aware that there had been some concern about an increase in traffic. Ms. Stringfellow stated that most of her students either car pool or walk.

Paul Hayward (1663 West 1410 North) stated he lived two houses away from the preschool and felt there had been no negative impact. He favored approval of the application. He also said he had done some research into licensing and found that the City had amended their ordinances to reflect State code.

With no further comments, **Chairman Hoffman** *CLOSED* the public hearing and asked the Commission for consideration.

Bart Hill *MOVED* that the Planning Commission modify the enclosed Conditional Use Permit C-13-95 by increasing the number of children attending the Li'l Rascals Preschool from 12 to 14. **Kent Forsgren** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Reasons for the motion included:

- ▮ The application met City ordinances.
- ▮ There had been no negative public response to the application.
- ▮ The preschool met with State as well as City standards.
- ▮ The preschool is a service to the community and presented no nuisance.

PUBLIC HEARING: ROSE COVE APTS, L.P. PETER S. COOKE REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO MODIFY CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT C-7-00 BY PROVIDING COVERED PARKING FOR 82 EXISTING PARKING STALLS AT THE ROSE COVE APARTMENTS LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 847 NORTH SHEPARD CREEK PARKWAY IN AN R-4 (PUD) ZONE (Agenda Item #5)

David Petersen briefly reviewed information about the agenda item. The packet contained pictures of the proposed parking covers.

Chairman Hoffman opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING*.

Paul Hayward (1663 West 1410 North) was in favor of the covered parking as proposed by the applicant. He said he felt it would improve the apartments and make them more marketable. He wondered when the concrete barriers would be removed.

Kirk Barker (988 North Shepard Lane) observed that much of the Rose Cove complex was still vacant. He worried about the area and if indeed covered parking would solve some of the problems he had noticed. He felt that the area had been poorly planned and that promises made through agreements with the City had not been honored. The property was not attractive nor was it beneficial to the surrounding developments.

Keith Bennet (architect for the developer) stated the apartment building was for senior citizens who traditionally take longer to make a decision regarding living accommodations. It was his opinion that there was a strong feeling among seniors that they would want covered parking for protection from the elements.

Mr. Petersen reported that half the apartment buildings had not yet received certificates of occupancy permits. Total occupancy in facilities of this nature could take as long as 10 months

or longer. The Rose Cove facility had only been open for 5 months. As reported by the builder, lease rates had been slow. The builder felt that covered parking would help encourage sales.

With no further comments, **Ms. Hoffman** *CLOSED* the public hearing.

Mr. Forsgren inquired whether or not the Planning Commission could require specific building materials or appearance requirements for the covered parking.

Mr. Petersen reported such was within the bounds of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Bennett stated the purpose of the covered parking was utilitarian only.

Sid Young commented that the construction should be required to withstand Farmington winds.

Cory Ritz *MOVED* that the Planning Commission approve the request to modify Conditional Use Permit C-7-00 by amending the approved site plan to provide the covered parking as illustrated by the applicant. **Sid Young** seconded the motion, which passed by a 3 to 2 vote. Bart Hill, Cory Ritz, and Sid Young voted in favor of the motion. Cindy Roybal and Kent Forsgren opposed the motion.

In discussion of the action, **Ms. Roybal** stated she opposed the motion because past experience with the development indicated a propensity to change agreements and to deteriorate quality of construction. **Mr. Forsgren** said he would like to see alternate plans for the construction before he gave his affirmative vote.

Upon request **Mr. Petersen** reviewed the process for appeal of Planning Commission decisions.

After discussion, **Sid Young** *MOVED* that the Planning Commission reconsider the previous motion. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. The Planning Commission discussed the quality of construction proposed and the impact on surrounding neighborhoods and past experiences with the developer.

Kent Forsgren *MOVED* to table Rose Cove's request for approval to modify conditional use permit C-7-00 by providing covered parking for 82 existing parking stalls at the Rose Cove Apartments at approximately 847 North Shepard Creek Parkway and to require the applicant to bring back a covered parking design more compatible with surrounding structures and Farmington standards. **Cindy Roybal** seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission discussed the issues. **Ms. Roybal** said she felt her decision was based on the public input voicing concern about the quality of construction.

Mr. Petersen suggested an amendment to the motion, that it include language wherein there would be a public hearing at the time the applicant brought back a new design. Both Mr.

Forsgren and Ms. Roybal concurred to the amendment.

PUBLIC HEARING: COWBOY PARTNERS, L.C., DAN LOFGREN REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO AMEND CHAPTER 14 (BUSINESS PARK ZONE [BP]) TO INCREASE THE ALLOWABLE RESIDENTIAL DENSITY FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS (PUD'S) IN THE BP ZONE FROM 8 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE TO 14 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE (ZT-4-02) (Agenda Item #6)

The applicant is further requesting a recommendation to the City Council to grant schematic or concept plan approval for the proposed Liberty Lane PUD located north of the Lagoon Drive/Burke Lane intersection adjacent to the north side of Burke Lane.

Background Information

As reported in the background information for agenda item #2, (Danville Land Investment rezone request), the economic viability of the community is often directly determined by the total number of “rooftops” developed per acre. Recently the Farmington City Council and Planning Commission met to hear a presentation which discussed among other things implications of certain tax revenue/municipal service policies. It was demonstrated to Farmington City officials that low density residential development does not pay its own way or in

other words it is not sustainable development. Meanwhile, agriculture land or higher density development provides economic benefits to the community not realized by low density residential development.

The Planning Commission may wish to consider the following issues regarding this application:

1. Is this an appropriate location for high density, multi-family development? Will this block or decrease the commercial potential of this property and other areas north of Lagoon Drive and east of U.S. 89?
2. What implications will the proposed zone text change have on other parcels now currently zoned Business Park?
3. The City is currently embarking on an economic development/land use study. This study may take 6 to 12 months to complete. Should the Planning Commission delay a decision regarding this application until the study is finalized?

General Plan Analysis:

The General Plan offers the following regarding multi-family development:

“While low density, single-family residences are most preferred in Farmington, a few areas may be appropriate for some limited higher density residential development. The City should provide in its General Plan for a range of residential densities. Higher density development should be limited to those areas that are adjacent to commercial properties and along high volume traffic corridors where they can be more easily designed to buffer the impacts of these intense land uses from lower density residential neighborhoods. Preference should be given to privately owned condominium or planned unit development projects or other types of multiple unit development. Rental units should be limited to duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes. For the purpose of this General Plan, multiple family refers to a single building containing two or more dwelling units.”

“In those limited areas where the General Plan recommends such developments, multiple family residential developments should be compatible with the surrounding area, not negatively impact neighboring residential areas and conform to strict design and buffering criteria established for such development.”

“In all zones where multiple family residential uses are permitted, they should be permitted only as conditional uses which will give the Planning Commission the opportunity to thoroughly evaluate a proposed development in a public hearing.”

The General Plan map identifies this area for office/business park uses. The only reference related to this specific parcel in the text of the General Plan related to these uses states:

“Clarify the intent of the special use zoning along the north side of Burke Lane between Main Street and Highway 89 by rezoning to the new BP zone.”

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the background information.

Chairman Hoffman opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING*.

Dan Lofgren (developer) presented the apartment project being proposed for the area north of Lagoon Drive along Burke Lane. The design calls for 14 dwellings units per building (8 buildings) which calculated to 12.47 dwelling units per acre. The developer recognized the need for Farmington to provide for a broad range of income housing including housing for people who were “life style renters.” The apartments proposed were high end expensive homes of choice and were not necessarily affordable housing units. Mr. Lofgren stated 53 percent of the property would be landscaped. A trail system was designed through the project. Also included was ample open space. The apartment buildings and landscaped areas would offer a beneficial transitional portal to the City. Cowboy Partners would manage the buildings themselves. He commented that high density was not always a negative for a City like Farmington and that such could be a tool for land management.

Dick Dejong (750 North Shepard Lane) stated that traffic in the area is already very congested, and the large complex would add to the problem. He suggested the Planning Commission table consideration of the agenda item until after the economic study was completed.

Paul Hayward (1663 West 1410 North) stated he felt the apartment buildings may not be the best project for the entrance to the City. He also noted that the buildings were three stories high. Sound mitigation may be a problem. Access to the buildings was also questionable for emergency vehicles. A hotel would be a much better use for the land and would be a great source of employment for Farmington residents.

Steven Elkins (57 East 1100 North) stated he thought the apartments would be an ideal use for the property, and he would like to see the buildings at the entrance to the City, especially with the park at the west end. He felt the apartments would be a good buffer for the area and would be well used in the City. The traffic could be directed away from the City directly on to the main traffic corridors. There is already a signal right there and there are two bus routes that pass in front of the complex.

Jody Allen (a member of the Dejong family) stated her family had farmed in the area for many years. She did not want to see the farms degenerate and have to be destroyed because apartment dwellers do not mix with the farming use. The entire area is a greenbelt that should not be disturbed. She also raised the issue of safety for children who may live in the apartments. Traffic would also increase.

Jackie Bourne Marsden (Salt Lake City resident) felt that the developer had a quality reputation and that the apartments would be well done. Development would be coming to the area. The property would be improved with some kind of facility. The apartment buildings would be a very good use for the land. Ms. Marsden stated her family had approached the City with several different options for development over the years. They had been turned down time after time because they were waiting for a study or for information or some other reason. She felt her family had been reasonable but would like to have the Planning Commission make a decision about what could be placed on the property. She stated again that she felt the apartment facility would be ideal for the area.

Mr. Petersen referred to a letter submitted by Adrain DeJong who was opposed to the development. Members of the Planning Commission were given copies.

With no further comments, **Chairman Hoffman** *CLOSED* the public hearing and asked the Commission for their input. Comments included the following:

- ▮ There was confidence expressed regarding the quality of construction and design for the apartment complex.
- ▮ Answers regarding the economic development study should be forthcoming

within a few months. The developer commented that his option to buy the property may well have lapsed by that time.

- ↯ Decisions made for the property need to include master planning for the property to the north.
- ↯ Making a text change in the General Plan will affect all of Farmington. Many Commission members hesitated to make such a recommendation for one parcel of land.
- ↯ Making a recommendation to the City Council to amend the General Plan or to grant schematic or concept plan approval does not vest the City and is not binding.
- ↯ The property which is an entrance to the City must be carefully planned.

Cory Ritz *MOVED* that the Planning Commission deny the current application for text change and that the developer be encouraged to submit a request to rezone the property. Further, that staff be asked to involve the economic development study consultant with the developer at the earliest possible date.

In discussion of the motion, **Ms. Roybal** stated that she felt the proposed complex was very nice. She had concerns with a zone change until she could have more information. Traffic along Burke Lane should be studied.

Sid Young seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Reasons for the motion included:

- ↯ The Commissioners were in favor of the project but had concerns about making text changes which would affect more than just the property in question.
- ↯ The Commissioners would like to have information from the economic development consultant at the earliest possible time and would like to have all parties contacted with information in order to expedite the project.

PUBLIC HEARING: RICK AND MARIANNE JOHANSEN SUBDIVISION (Agenda Item #7)

Background Information:

The Planning Commission may wish to consider the following information in review of the above referenced request.

1. Farmington City does not currently have an ordinance to accommodate “private drives.”
2. The maximum “stem” length for flag lots in Farmington is 150 feet.
3. Presently only one lot (not two) can be developed on one “stem” in Farmington.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the background information. He expressed serious concern over recommending a flag lot to the City Council. The City Council had not approved a flag lot for a long time.

Chairman Hoffman stated there were safety and privacy issues with flag lots. There followed a brief discussion of private drives which may exist in the City.

Mr. Petersen offered a few possible alternatives for the Johansen family, including a transfer of development rights.

The Planning Commission asked Mr. Peterson to work with the Johansen family to explore any alternatives in the ordinance that may accommodate their proposal

CITY COUNCIL REPORT AND MISCELLANEOUS

Mr. Petersen covered the following as miscellaneous items:

- ¬ The Wasatch Front Regional Council encouraged the Planning Commission members to attend the Transit 2030 Planning Workshop to be held on September 18 and 24. Information was contained in the packet.
- ¬ Bonneville Shoreline information was included in the packet. It was suggested that the information be passed along to the Farmington Trail Committee.
- ¬ Mr. Petersen reported progress of the City Council and County Officials in trying to convince UDOT that Farmington needed to have a slip off ramp in the Shepard Lane/Burke Lane area.

ADJOURNMENT

Kent Forsgren *MOVED* to adjourn at 10:25 P.M. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Farmington City Planning Commission

September 12, 2002

Linda Hoffman, Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission